

REMARKS

Claims 1-39 are pending in the application.

Claims 21-33 and 38-39 are allowed.

Claims 1-4, 6-18, 20 and 34-37 stand rejected.

Claims 5 and 19 stand objected.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 13-18, 20 and 34-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Claims 10-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 14, 16 and 34-37 stand amended. No new matter is added.

Claims 1-39 remain in the case for consideration.

Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

Specification

The Abstract is objected to because the final sentence of the abstract draws reference to purported merits of the invention.

The Abstract is amended to be replaced by the paragraph shown on page 2 of this paper.

Claim Objections

Claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claim recites the limitation "the opening" in line 1. There is no antecedent basis for this limitation.

Claim 16 is amended to correct the typographical error.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 13-18, 20 and 34-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,744,859 to Ouchida. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 14, 16 and 34-37 are all amended to clarify that the wavy portion of the beam leads are a *widthwise* wavy portion. Each beam lead has a length and a width with the length extending from the substrate. The waviness, as depicted in the top plan view of FIGS. 4A, 5A-C, 9A, 10A and 11 and described on page 6 at lines 6-13, is a widthwise waviness that is in addition to any vertical bending of the leads.

Ouchida only discloses *vertical* bends in the leads and does not disclose any widthwise waviness. For example, the perspective of FIG. 15 in Ouchida shows the inner leads 8a and 8a' bending downward to bump electrodes 15 but extending straight, widthwise across the device hole 21.

Independent claim 1 of the present application is amended to clarify that the beam leads have a length and a width and include a widthwise wavy portion. As stated above, Ouchida does not disclose widthwise wavy beam leads. Thus, Ouchida fails to disclose each and every element of amended independent claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is believed to be allowable and allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1, and for at least the reasons given for claim 1, these claims are believed to be allowable and allowance is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 6 of the present application is amended to clarify that the beam leads have a length and a width and include a widthwise wavy portion. As stated above, Ouchida does not disclose widthwise wavy beam leads. Thus, Ouchida fails to disclose each and every element of amended independent claim 6. Therefore, claim 6 is believed to be allowable and allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 7-9, 13-18 and 20 all depend from claim 6, and for at least the reasons given for claim 6, these claims are believed to be allowable and allowance is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 34 of the present application is amended to clarify that the beam leads have a length and a width and include a widthwise wavy portion. As stated above, Ouchida does not disclose widthwise wavy beam leads. Thus, Ouchida fails to disclose each and every element of amended independent claim 34. Therefore, claim 34 is believed to be allowable and allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 25-27 all depend from claim 34, and for at least the reasons given for claim 34, these claims are believed to be allowable and allowance is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ouchida. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 10-12 all depend from amended independent claim 6, and thus, necessarily include all of the elements of claim 6. As stated above, Ouchida fails to disclose the widthwise wavy beam leads recited in claim 6. Ouchida fails to disclose each and every element in claim 6, and therefore, fails to disclose each and every element in claims 10-12. Thus, Ouchida fails to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claims 10-12. Therefore, claims 10-12 are believed to be allowable and allowance is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 5 and 19 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The amendments to claims 1 and 6 are believed to place claims 5 and 19 in allowable form, and allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 21-33 and 38-39 are allowed.

In conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-39 of the application as amended is solicited. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Hosoon Lee
Reg. No. 56,737

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613
Customer No. 20575

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via facsimile number (571) 273-8300 on January 3, 2006.



Stormi R. Davis